arXiv:1204.1727v1 [math.OC] 8 Apr 2012

CONSTRUCTION OF A STABILIZING CONTROL AND SOLUTION TO A PROBLEM ABOUT THE CENTER AND FOCUS FOR DIFFERENTIAL SYSTEMS WITH A POLYNOMIAL PART ON THE RIGHT SIDE

I.M.Proudnikov

Russia, St. Petersburg University, pim_10@hotmail.com

Abstract Stationary differential systems with polynomial right sides are considered. Necessary and sufficient conditions are formulated when a given domain is a domain of asymptotic stability and the origin of coordinates is either focus or center. The problem of construction of a stabilizing control in the form of polynomial is studied.

Key words Differential systems of n-th order, asymptotic stable systems, stabilizing control, domains of asymptotic stability.

1 Introduction

In the 19^{th} century the great French mathematician Henri Poincaré formulated the problem of finding stability conditions for differential systems without calculation being a solution. At the end of 19^{th} and at the beginning of 20^{th} centuries the great Russian mathematician A.M.Lyapunov developed the mathematical stabilization theory for differential systems. For this purpose he developed two methods. The first one is based on the characteristic numbers of the fundamental matrix. The second one is based on construction of special functions called Lyapunov's functions which have properties similar to distance from a considered point to the origin of coordinates (it is supposed that the zero solution is stationary). Lyapunov's methods received world recognition.

In this paper, differential systems with a right polynomial part $f(.)$ of

$$x = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \Re^n$$

are considered i.e.

$$f(x) = (f_1(x), f_2(x), ..., f_n(x))^*,$$

where

$$f_p(x) = \sum_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n \in I_p} a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n} x_1^{l_1} x_2^{l_2} ... x_n^{l_n},$$

$p \in 1:n, l_1, l_2, ...l_n$ are non-negative integers and $*$ is the transposition sign, $a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n}$ are real-valued numbers, I_p is the set of degrees of the polynomial $f_p(x)$.

To analyze the system

$$\dot{x} = f(x)$$

a method is suggested which is different from Lyapunov's methods and based on a system transformation idea, so that we are able to say something definite about stability.

From the technical point of view the important problem is finding a domain of asymptotic stability. Conditions are given so that any domain including the origin of coordinates is one of them. Necessary and sufficient conditions are found when the origin of coordinates is either focus or center.

The case is considered when the coefficients $a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n}$ depend on t. Sufficient conditions are given for the problems formulated above.

The systems considered are interesting because asymptotic stability of the zero solution is equivalent to the following statement, that any solution of our system starting from any point of some small region of the origin of coordinates tended to be zero; this is not correct in general case.

Further, we solve the problem of constructing a stabilizing control in any given region of the origin of coordinates for the system

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u),$$

where $x \in \Re^n$ is a phase vector , $u \in R^r$ is a control, $f(x, u) = (f_1(x, u), f_2(x, u), ..., f_n(x, u))^*$ is a vector polynomial of x and u i.e.

$$f_p(x, u) = \sum_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n,m_1,m_2,...,m_r \in I_p} a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n,m_1,m_2,...,m_r} x_1^{l_1} x_2^{l_2} ... x_n^{l_n} u_1^{m_1} u_2^{m_2} ... u_r^{m_r},$$

$p \in 1 : n,\ \ l_1, l_2, ..., l_n, m_1, m_2, ..., m_r$ are non-negative integers, $a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n,m_1,m_2,...,m_r}$ are real-valued numbers, I_p is the set of degrees of the polynomial $f_p(x, u)$. We assume that the zero vector $0 = (0, 0, ..., 0) \in \Re^n$ is a solution of the system i.e. $f(0, 0) = 0$.

The theorem was proved that any region including the origin of coordinates can be made a region of asymptotic stability if we choose a suitable control $u(x)$. The control $u(x)$ is chosen as a polynomial with a degree not higher than the degree of the vector-function $f(x, u)$ as a function of x.

The formulated problem about asymptotic stability of a system with a right polynomial part is very important for practical applications in physics and technics and can be found in the book by V.I.Zubov "The lectures on the control theory", 1975. p.60.

2 Domains of asymptotic stability

Let us consider the differential system

$$\dot{x} = f(x), \tag{1}$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \Re^n$ and

$$f(x) = (f_1(x), f_2(x), ..., f_n(x))^*.$$

The vector-polynomials $f_p(.)$ and their coefficients $a^p_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n}$ satisfy the conditions in the Introduction.

We assume that $f(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \neq 0$ in some neighborhood of the origin of coordinates 0.

We will call the order $deg(f_p(.))$ of the polynomial $f_p(\cdot)$ the maximal degree of the polynomial $f_p(.)$ in the variables $x_j, j \in 1:n$, in totality i.e.

$$deg(f_p(x)) = \max_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n \in I_p} (l_1 + l_2 + ... + l_n).$$

So if for $n = 2$ and $l_{ij} \neq 0$

$$f_1(x) = l_{11}x_1^2 + l_{12}x_2^2 + l_{13}x_1x_2, \quad f_2(x) = l_{21}x_1^3 + l_{22}x_2 + l_{23}x_3,$$

then the order of $f_1(x)$ is equal to two and the order of $f_2(x)$ is equal to three.

We will call the order of the function $f(.)$ the maximal degree of the polynomials $f_p(x), p \in 1:n$, regarding the variables $x_j, j \in 1:n$, i.e.

$$deg(f(x)) = \max_{p \in 1:n} deg(f_p(x)).$$

Consequently, the order of the function $f(.)$ for the example written above is equal to $\max(2,3) = 3$.

We assume that the definitions of stability and asymptotic stability are known (see [1]-[4]).

Definition 2.1 *[1], [2] A domain $D, 0 \in intD$, consisting of whole trajectories of the system (1), is called a region of asymptotic stability if the limit*

$$\parallel x(t, x_0, t_0) \parallel \to 0 \tag{2}$$

when $t \to \infty$ is fulfilled for any initial point $x_0 \in D$ and any solution $x(\cdot), x(t_0) = x_0$, of the system (1). In this case we will call the system (1) asymptotic stable in D.

The following problem is important for practical applications.

Problem 2.1 *It is known that zero solution of the system*

$$\dot{x}= Ax, \tag{3}$$

$A[n\times n], x\in \Re^n$, is asymptotic stable if all eigen-values of the matrix A have negative real parts. In this case the system (3) is asymptotic stable in $\Re^n$.

Consider now the differential system

$$\dot{x}= Ax+\varphi(x) \tag{4}$$

where $\varphi(\cdot)$ is a vector polynomial with degree not less than two, $\varphi(0)=0$.

What are the conditions on the coefficients of the vector- polynomial $\varphi(\cdot)$ from (4) under which the system (4) is asymptotic stable in a given domain $D, 0\in intD$, i.e. for any solution of the system (4) and any initial point $x_0\in D$ the limit (2) is true?

The considered circle of questions includes the problem about center and focus. This problem is formulated in the following way.

Problem 2.2 *Assume that the origin of coordinates (0,0) for the system (3), $n=2$, $x\in\Re^2$ is the center. The necessary and sufficient conditions for this are that all eigen-values of the matrix A are imaginary. By adding a vector polynomial $\varphi(\cdot)$ (system (4)) the center (0,0) can be a focus. It is needed to find conditions on the coefficients of the polynomial $\varphi(\cdot)$ that the point (0,0) was the center of the differential system (4).*

Let us rewrite the system (1) in equivalent form

$$\dot{x}= A(x)x. \tag{5}$$

The elements $a_{ij}(x)$ of a matrix $A(x)[n\times n]$ are continuous polynomial functions of x. Conversion (4) to (5) is not unique. It can be done in an infinite number of ways. In fact,

$$a_{ij}(x)=\sum_{l_1+l_2+...+l_n\le deg(f)} \alpha^{(i)}_{j,l_1,l_2,...,l_n}(x)x_1^{l_1}x_2^{l_2}...x_j^{l_j-1}...x_n^{l_n}$$

if $l_j\ge 1$. We have the following correlation for the coefficients

$$\sum_j \alpha^{(i)}_{j,l_1,l_2,...,l_n}(x)=a^{(i)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n} \tag{6}$$

for all x from some region $D, 0\in intD$.

For instance, let the system (1) have the right part

$$f(x)=\begin{pmatrix} x_1^2x_2+x_2+2x_1x_2^2 \\ -x_1+3x_1^2x_2-2x_1x_2^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$A(x)=\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1x_1x_2+\alpha_2x_2^2 & 1+\beta_1x_1^2+\beta_2x_1x_2 \\ -1+\gamma_1x_1x_2+\gamma_2x_2^2 & \delta_1x_1^2+\delta_2x_1x_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where the coefficients $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i, \beta_i, i = 1, 2$ such that

$$\alpha_1 + \beta_1 = 1, \quad \gamma_1 + \delta_1 = 3,$$

$$\alpha_2 + \beta_2 = 2, \quad \gamma_2 + \delta_2 = -2.$$

The system (4) for the given vector function $f(\cdot)$ can be rewritten in the following form

$$\dot{x} = A_0 x + C(x)x \tag{7}$$

where

$$C(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 x_1 x_2 + \alpha_2 x_2^2 & \beta_1 x_1^2 + \beta_2 x_1 x_2 \\ \gamma_1 x_1 x_2 + \gamma_2 x_2^2 & \delta_1 x_1^2 + \delta_2 x_1 x_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the eigen-values of the matrix A_0 are $\lambda_{1,2} = \pm i$, the point (0,0) is the center for the linearized system. But it is question for the nonlinear system (7).

We will consider all possible continuous matrices $A(x)$ whose elements are polynomial functions of x for which the system (5) is equivalent to the system (1) . We will denote the set of all such matrices by $\mathcal{A}$.

Let us solve the problem 2.1.

Theorem 2.1 *In order that a domain D consisting of the whole trajectories of the system (1) i.e. $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0) \in D, x_0 \in D$, for all $t > t_0$ is a region of asymptotic stability it is necessary and sufficient that there is a matrix $A(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ of the system (5) in the domain D whose eigen-values have negative real parts at any point $x \in D, x \neq 0$.*

Proof. Necessity. Let a domain D be asymptotic stable. Consider any trajectory $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0), x(t_0) = x_0$. There is such a transformation $\xi = X(x)$ of $\Re^n$ in a neighborhood of a point $x_1 = x(t_1)$ that transforms the system (1) to the differential system

$$\dot{\xi} = B(\xi)\xi \tag{8}$$

where the matrix B has the eigen-values with negative real parts.

Indeed for any point $x(t_1, x_0, t_0), t_1 > t_0$ there is a linear transformation T_x defined in a small neighborhood of the point $x(t_1, x_0, t_0)$ and that is the linear part of the transformation $X(.)$ in this neighborhood, so that the system (1) is transformed by this transformation to the differential system (8) and the vector

$$x_1 = \dot{x}\ (t_1, x_0, t_0)$$

is transformed to the vector

$$\xi_1 = \dot{\xi}\ (t_1, x_0, x_0).$$

Any differential equation can be defined by its current of tangent vectors. If we choose an asymptotic stable linear differential system like the system (3) which current of tangent vectors is close to current of tangent vectors of our system locally for each point x of the domain D then the eigen-values of the matrix of this asymptotic stable linear differential system will have negative real parts. Consequently, the above mentioned transformation $X(x)$ exists.

As soon as the system (8) is transformed to the system

$$\dot{x} = T_x^{-1} B(\xi_1) T_x x$$

under the linear transformation

$$\xi = T_x\, x$$

in a neighborhood of the point ξ_1 and all locally linear transformations of the system (1) have the form (5), then the matrix $A(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ exists for which

$$A(x(t_1, x_0)) = T_x^{-1} B(\xi_1) T_x \tag{9}$$

and the eigen-values of the matrix $A(x(t_1))$ are equal to the eigen-values of the matrix B.

Since the transformations T_x and T_x^{-1} are continuous with respect to x, the matrix $A(.)$ is also continuous with respect to $x \in D$.

Sufficiency. Let the system (1) admit such a transformation to the form (5) that all eigen-values of a matrix $A(x)$ have negative real parts for all $x \in D, x \neq 0$. We prove that the domain D is a region of asymptotic stability.

Fist we remark that in general case not any solution of the system (1)

$$x(t) = x(t, x_0, t_0), \;\; x(t_0) = x_0$$

can be represented in the form

$$\dot{x}\,(t) = e^{\int_{t_0}^{t} A(x(\tau))d\tau} x_0 \tag{10}$$

where integration is taken along the integral curve $x(.)$.

Instead of (10) we will use the sequential approximations $\{x_k(t)\}$ of the system (1) on the segment $[t_0, t]$ having the form

$$x_k(t) = e^{A(x_{k-1})(t-t_{k-1})} x_{k-1}(t) \tag{11}$$

where $\{t_i\}$ is a subdivision set of the segment $[t_0, t]$ and

$$x_{i+1} = e^{A(x_i)(t_{i+1}-t_i)} x_i, \;\; i \in 0 : (k-1). \tag{12}$$

If we substitute (12) into (11) we will get

$$x_k(t) = e^{A(x_{k-1})(t-t_{k-1})} e^{A(x_{k-2})(t_{k-1}-t_{k-2})} ... e^{A(x_0)(t_1-t_0)} x_0. \tag{13}$$

Since $A(x_i) \underset{\substack{x_i \to x(\tau) \\ t_i \to \tau}}{\longrightarrow} A(x(t))$, where $x(.)$ is a solution of (5), we have

$$x_k(\tau) \Longrightarrow x(\tau) \tag{14}$$

uniformly on $\tau \in [t_0, t]$ when $k \to \infty$ and

$$\max{}_{i \in 1:k} \mid t_i - t_{i-1} \mid \to_k 0.$$

It is obvious that all matrices $A(x_i), i \in 0 : (k-1)$, have the eigen-values with negative real-valued parts for enough big k.

Denote by $\lambda_i(x_j)$ the eigen-values of the matrix $A(x_j), i \in 1 : n, j \in 0 : k-1$. Then a number $C > 0$ exists that

$$\|e^{A(x_{k-1})(t-t_{k-1})} e^{A(x_{k-2})(t_{k-1}-t_{k-2})} ... e^{A(x_0)(t_1-t_0)} x_0\| \le C e^{\lambda(t)(t-t_0)} \|x_0\|$$

where

$$\lambda(t) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \max_{\substack{j \in 0 : k-1, \\ i \in 1 : n}} Re\ \lambda_i(x_j).$$

Since $\lambda(t) < 0$ for any $t > t_0$,

$$\lambda(t)(t - t_0) < 0.$$

Let

$$-a < \lambda(t)(t - t_0) < 0, a > 0.$$

This relation means that the trajectory $x(\cdot)$ can not go to a stationary point or be a stationary orbit. Indeed if the trajectory $x(.)$ has a stationary point or is a stationary orbit then

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \lambda(t)(t - t_0) = -\infty.$$

Consequently,

$$\| x(t, x_0, t_0) \| \longrightarrow 0$$

when $t \longrightarrow \infty$. We obtain the contradiction. Thus, the origin of coordinates can be only a stationary point. The sufficiency and the theorem are proved. □

Remark 2.1 *It follows from the Necessity of the Theorem 2.1 that there is one-to- one correspondence between the matrices $A(x) \in \mathcal{A}$ of the system (5) and locally linear transformations T_x of the system (1) defined in a neighborhood of the point x(see (9)) . Indeed, there is a matrix $A(.)$ for any transformation T_x and, on the contrary, there is own coordinate system for any matrix $A(x) \in \mathcal{A}$, in which the equation (9) is true.*

Corollary 2.1 . *It follows from the Necessity of the Theorem 2.1 that the degree on x of any element of a matrix $A(x)$ which we denote by $a_{ij}(x), j \in 1 : n$, that is a polynomial of x, does not exceed the degree of the vector-function $f(\cdot)$.*

Proof The sum of the coefficients $a_{ij}(x) \cdot x_j$ over j is equal to zero for those elements that do not belong to $f_i(\cdot)$. And on the contrary the sum of the coefficients $\alpha^{(i)}_{j,l_1,l_2,\ldots,l_n}$ over j is not zero for those elements that are the terms of $f_i(\cdot)$. It follows from here that choosing $\alpha^{(i)}_{j,l_1,l_2,\ldots,l_n}$ from the system (6) we can only consider the elements of the vector-polynomial $f(\cdot)$. □

Corollary 2.2 . *For asymptotic stability of a solution* $x(., x_0, t_0)$, $x(t_0) = x_0$, *of the differential equation (1) it is sufficient that there was* $\delta(t_0, \varepsilon) > 0$ *for any* $t_0, \varepsilon > 0$ *that for* $\| x_0 \| < \delta$

$$\| x(t, x_0, t_0) \| \longrightarrow 0$$

when $t \longrightarrow \infty$.

Proof. As soon as the eigen-values of a matrix $A(\cdot)$ have negative real parts in any neighborhood of the origin of coordinates from which any solution tends to zero-vector , then for any k we have from (13) that

$$\| x_k(t) \| \leq \| x_0 \| < \varepsilon$$

and in limit on k

$$\| x(t, x_0, t_0) \| \leq \| x_0 \| < \varepsilon$$

i.e. all solutions are in an ε -neighborhood of the origin of coordinates. The latter means stability. The Corollary is proved. □

3 To problem about center and focus

The following problem is interesting from technical point of view: to recognize focus or center i.e. to give the conditions when trajectories turn around and go to the origin of coordinates or remain closed.

From the start we will give the definitions of focus or center. Beforehand we define trajectories turning around some ray with the initial point $0 \in \Re^n$ infinitely often.

Definition 3.1 *Let us say that a trajectory* $x(t, x_0, t_0)$ *turns around a ray* $l \in \Re^n$ *with the initial point* $0 \in \Re^n$ *infinitely often if the radius vector* $r(t) = x(t, x_0, t_0)$ *forms with the ray* l *an angle* $\varphi(t)$ *taking all values from a segment* $[\varphi_1, \varphi_2]$ *infinite number of times.*

Definition 3.2 *We will call the point* $0 \in \Re^n$ *focus of the system (1) if*

1) the point 0 *is asymptotic stable ;*

2) any solution $x(t, x_0, t_0)$ *of the system* (1) *turns around a ray* $l \in \Re^n$ *with the initial point* $0 \in \Re^n$ *infinite number of times.*

Definition 3.3 *We will call the point 0 a center of the system (1) if*

1) the point 0 is stable ;

2) all solutions $x(t, x_0, t_0)$ *of the system* (1) *remain in some neighborhood of the point 0 and are closed loops.*

Definition 3.4 *We will call the point* $0 \in \Re^n$ *a node of the system (1) if*

1) the point 0 *is asymptotic stable ;*

2) there are not a ray $l \in \Re^n$ *with the initial point* $0 \in \Re^n$ *and a solution* $x(t, x_0, t_0)$ *of the system* (1) *turning around the ray* l *infinite number of times.*

Theorem 3.1 *In order that the point* $0 \in \Re^n$ *is a focus of the system (1) with a right polynomial part* $f(.), f(x) \neq 0$ *for* $x \neq 0$ *it is necessary and sufficient that*

1. *There is such a continuous matrix* $A(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ *of the system (5) that all its eigen-values at any point* $x, x \neq 0$, *from some neighborhood* D *of the origin of coordinates, consisting from the whole trajectories, have negative real parts and non-zero imaginary parts.*

2. *There is no matrix* $A(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ *of the system (5) with the negative real-valued eigen-values at all points* $x \in D, x \neq 0$.

Proof. Necessity. Let the point 0 be a focus for the system (1). There is such a transformation $\xi = X(x)$ so that the system (1) can be rewritten in a neighborhood of some point $x_1, x_1 \neq 0$, in the form

$$\dot{\xi} = B(\xi)\xi$$

where $B(\xi)$ is a matrix whose eigen-values have negative real parts and nonzero imaginary parts.

Consider any trajectory $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0), x(t_0) = x_0$. Then for any point $x_1 \in x(t, x_0, t_0), x_1 \neq 0$, there is a transformation T_{x_1} in a neighborhood of the point x_1 that the system (1) can be rewritten in the form indicated above.

If the trajectories of the system (1) do not turn around any ray $l \in \Re^n$ with the initial point $0 \in \Re^n$ infinite number of times then such system can be transformed by some continuous transformation that corresponds to some matrix $A(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ that is the matrix of the system (5) whose eigen-values are negative real-valued numbers at all points $x \in D$ (theorem 2.1). The latter is impossible according to the Condition 2 of the theorem.

Sufficiency. Let the conditions 1,2 of the theorem be true. Prove that the point 0 is a focus of the system (1).

Any solution $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0), x(t_0) = x_0$, is the limit of some sequence $x_k(t)$ on $k \to \infty$ obtained from (13). According to the conditions all matrices $A(x_j), j \in 1:k$, have the eigen-values $\lambda_l(x_j), j \in 1:k, l \in 1:n$ with negative real-valued parts $a_l(\cdot)$ and nonzero imaginary parts $b_l(\cdot) : \lambda_l(x) = a_l(x) + ib_l(x), i^2 = -1,\ l \in 1:n$, that are nonzero at any point $x \in D$. It follows from here that the point 0 is either focus or node.

We will prove that under the Condition 2 all trajectories turn around a ray $l \in \Re^n$ with the initial point $0 \in \Re^n$ infinite number of times. If it is not true, then there is such a transformation which corresponds to a matrix $A(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ whose eigen-values are negative real-valued numbers for $x \in D, x \neq 0$. This contradicts the Condition 2. The sufficiency and the theorem are proved. □

Corollary 3.1 *If instead of the Condition 2 of the Theorem 3.1 we require that there is a matrix $A(.) \in \mathcal{A}$ of the system (5) with the eigen-values $\lambda_i(x),\ i \in 1:n$, described in the condition 1 for which*

$$Im\ \lambda_i(x) > a,\ \ a > 0$$

or

$$Im\ \lambda_i(x) < a,\ \ a < 0,$$

where $Im\,\lambda_k(.)$ denotes the imaginary part of $\lambda_k(.)$, for $x \in D, x \neq 0$, then all trajectories turn around a ray $l \in \Re^n$ with the initial point $0 \in \Re^n$ infinite number of times.

Proof. From the representation of any solution of the system (1) as a limit of sequence $\{x_j(.)\}$ from (13) it follows that a solution $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0)$ has a finite number of turns around any ray $l \in \Re^n$ with the initial point $0 \in \Re^n$ if and only if for any $i \in 1:n$ the sum

$$\sum_{j \in 1:k} Im\lambda_i(x_{j-1})(t_j - t_{j-1}),$$

where $x_j(.)$ was defined in (13), or in the limit on $k \to \infty$ the integral

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} Im\ \lambda_i(x(\tau))d\tau$$

is convergent. But under the condition of Corollary 3.1 this integral is divergent. The corollary is proved. □

Mathematicians were concerned about the problem of recognition of center ore focus for a long time. The theorem given below for two dimensional system with a right polynomial part has the point $0 = (0, 0)$ as a center.

Theorem 3.2 *In order that the point $0 = (0, 0)$ be a center for the two-dimensional system (1) it is necessary and sufficient that there was a matrix $A(.) \in \mathcal{A}$ of the system (5) whose eigen-values are non-zero imaginary numbers in a neighborhood S of the origin of coordinates, consisting from whole trajectories, where $f(x) \neq 0$ for $x \neq 0, x \in S$.*

Proof. Necessity. Let the point $0 = (0, 0)$ be a center of the system (1). Prove that the condition of the theorem is true.

Take such a small neighborhood S of the origin of coordinates where all trajectories starting in S are closed loops. Consider any trajectory $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0), x(t_0) = x_0$. Take a point

$$x_1 = x(t_1, x_0, t_0).$$

There is such a transformation T_x in a small enough neighborhood of the point $x_1, x_1 \neq 0$, that the system (1) can be rewritten in the form

$$\dot{\xi} = B(\xi)\xi$$

and the matrix $B(.)$ has the imaginary eigen-values for all $\xi \in S$. As was proved above (Theorem 2.1, the Proof of the Necessity) the matrix $B(\cdot)$ corresponds to some matrix $A(\cdot)$ that like the matrix $B(\cdot)$ has the imaginary eigen-values. The necessity is proved.

Sufficiency. Let the condition of the theorem be true. Prove that the point $0=(0,0)$ is the center.

As soon as any transformation T_x is defined in a small neighborhood of the point x, then the above statement is not sufficient for the point $0=(0,0)$ to be a center. The point $0=(0,0)$ may happen to be a focus convergent (nonconvergent) with a finite number of turns around any ray $l \in \Re^n$ with the initial point 0. But it is impossible because from the limit of the sequence (13) we conclude that for any k

$$\| x_k(t) \| = \| x_0 \| .$$

From (14) it follows that the solution $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0)$ can't go to the origin of coordinates.

A set of closed and not closed loops could occur. From the representation of an integral curve $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0)$ in the form (13) and (14) it follows that there is not a matrix $A(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ with the imaginary eigen-values at all points of a small neighborhood of the origin of coordinates. The latter contradicts the condition of the theorem.

There is another case when for all $i \in 1:n$ the sum

$$\sum_{j \in 1:k} Im\lambda_i(x_{j-1})(t_j - t_{j-1})$$

or in the limit on $k \to \infty$ the integral

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} Im\ \lambda_i(x(\tau))d\tau$$

has a finite value where $\lambda_i(\cdot)$, $i \in 1:n$, are the eigen-values of the matrix $A(\cdot)$. In this case the trajectory $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0)$ goes to some stationary point $\hat{x} \in S, \hat{x} \neq 0$. It means that $f(\hat{x}) = 0$. This contradicts the condition of the theorem. Consequently, the point 0 is the center. The sufficiency and the theorem are proved. □

Corollary 3.2 *If a matrix $A(.) \in \mathcal{A}$ of the system (5) exists with the imaginary eigen-values $\lambda_i(x)$ for all $x \in S$ where S is a neighborhood of the origin of coordinates 0, consisting from whole trajectories, and*

$$Im\ \lambda_i(x) > 0$$

or

$$Im\ \lambda_i(x) < 0$$

for all $x \in S, x \neq 0$, and $i \in 1:n$ then the point 0 is the center of the n-dimensional system (1).

Proof. Indeed, if the conditions of the Corollary 3.2 hold, then the conditions of the Theorem 3.2 hold as well. □

The Corollary 3.2 does not require that $f(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \neq 0$ from some neighborhood of the origin of coordinates.

Remark 3.1 *The theorem can be proved for any n-even-dimensional spaces. It is not difficult to see that for n dimensional spaces with n odd,* $n = 2k+1, k$ *is a natural number, the system (1) can not have the origin of coordinates as a center. Indeed, there is no imaginary number among the eigen-values of any matrix* $A(\cdot)$ *for odd n.*

Remark 3.2 *Let us consider the differential system*

$$\dot{x} = f(x,t) \tag{15}$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \Re^n$ *and*

$$f(x,t) = (f_1(x,t), f_2(x,t), ..., f_n(x,t))^*.$$

The vector-function $f_p(.)$ *is a polynomial of* x *i.e.*

$$f_p(x) = \sum_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n \in I_p} a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n}(t) x_1^{l_1} x_2^{l_2} ... x_n^{l_n},$$

$p \in 1:n, l_1, l_2, ...l_n$ *are non-negative integers,* $a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n}(t)$ *are continuous real-valued functions and* $*$ *is the transposition sign,* I_p *is a finite set of indexes of the polynomial* $f_p(.)$. *We will assume that* $f(x,t) \neq 0$ *for all* $x \neq 0$ *in some neighborhood of the origin of coordinates* 0 *and* $t > t_0$.

In this case we will denote by $\lambda_i(x,t), i \in 1:n$, *the eigen-values of a matrix* $A(.)$. *If we demand that all cited above statements about the eigen-values* $\lambda_i(x,t), i \in 1:n$, *are true for all* $t > t_0$ *then we obtain the sufficient conditions for the cited above theorems and corollaries.*

Problem 3.1 *For the system*

$$\dot{x} = f(x,t) \tag{16}$$

where $f(.,.)$ *is a polynomial of* x *and* t *it is required to find some conditions when the system (16) is asymptotic stable in a domain* $D, 0 \in intD$.

The ideas stated above do not apply to the system (16) because the terms of $f(.,.)$ can be unbounded along some solution $x(\cdot, x_0, t_0)$ in D. If we require the terms of $f(.,.)$ to be bounded along the trajectories of the system (16) and that $\| \dot{x}\ (t, x_0, t_0) \|$ goes to zero uniformly on x_0 when $t \longrightarrow \infty$, then this system can be transformed to an equivalent stationary system. This idea will be developed in following articles.

4 Stabilizing control

Let us go to the question of finding a stabilizing control.

Let us consider the differential system

$$\dot{x}= f(x,u) \tag{17}$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \Re^n$ is a phase vector, $u = (u_1, u_2, ..., u_r) \in \Re^r$ is a control, $f(x,u) = (f_1(x,u), f_2(x,u), ..., f_n(x,u))^*$ is a vector-polinimial of x and u with constant real-valued coefficients, i.e.

$$f_p(x,u) = \sum_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n,m_1,m_2,...,m_r \in I_p} a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n,m_1,m_2,...,m_r} x_1^{l_1} x_2^{l_2} ... x_n^{l_n} u_1^{m_1} u_2^{m_2} ... u_r^{m_r},$$

$p \in 1 : n$, $l_1, l_2, ..., l_n, m_1, m_2, ..., m_r$ are non-negative integers and $a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,...,l_n,m_1,m_2,...,m_r}$ are real-valued numbers, I_p is a finite set of indexes of the polynomial $f_p(.)$.

Let us assume that the zero-vector $0 = (0, 0, ..., 0) \in \Re^n$ is a solution of the system (17) for $u = 0 \in \Re^r$.

Definition 4.1 *The control $u(x) = (u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_r(x)) \in \Re^r$ is called stabilizing in a domain $D \in \Re^n$, $0 \in intD$, for the system (17) if any solution of (17) $x(t) = x(t, x_0, t_0, u(x(t)))$ satisfies the limit*

$$\| x(t, x_0, t_0, u) \| \longrightarrow 0 \tag{18}$$

when $t \longrightarrow \infty$, $x(t_0) = x_0 \in D$.

As stated above the condition (18) is sufficient for the system (17) to be asymptotic stable in D, i.e. the zero solution of the system (17) is asymptotic stable and the limit (18) is true for any initial point $x(t_0) = x_0 \in D$.

Problem 4.1 *It is required to find such a stabilizing control $u = u(x)$ in a given domain $D, 0 \in intD, x \in D$ that for any solution $x(t, x_0, t_0, u), x(t_0) = x_0$ of the system (17) the correlation (18) was true.*

For linear system

$$\dot{x}= Ax + Bu, \tag{19}$$

where $B[n \times r]$ is a matrix of amplification coefficients, a stabilizing control $u \in \Re^r$ can be chosen in the form $u = Cx$ so that (18) is true.

Theorem 4.1 *[1],[4]. If the rank of the system*

$$B,\ AB,\ A^2B,\ ...,\ A^{n-1}B$$

is equal to n then we can always construct a stabilizing control in $\Re^n$ in the form

$$u = Cx,$$

where $C[r \times n]$ is some matrix.

Since the matrix B is defined by technical essence of the system, we can choose it constructing a system by ourselves . Therefore the condition of the theorem can be always satisfied.

The theorem was written for analogy and comparison with the results below.

Our goal is to construct a stabilizing control $u(x)$ that a domain D were a domain of asymptotic stability. In common case it is not always can be done. But if we change the system (17) a little bit the problem can be solved. Instead of the equation (17) we will consider the equation

$$\dot{x} = f(x,u) + \varphi(u) \tag{20}$$

where $\varphi(\cdot)$ is a vector-polynomial $\varphi(u) = (\varphi_1(u), \varphi_2(u), ..., \varphi_n(u))^*$ with the degree not bigger than the degree of the function $f(z)$ as a function of $z = (x,u)$,

$$\varphi_p(u) = \sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r \in M_p} b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r} u_1^{i_1} u_2^{i_2} ... u_r^{i_r}$$

where $p \in 1:n$ and $b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r}$ are constant real-valued numbers, $i_1, i_2, ..., i_r$ are non-negative integers, M_p is a finite set of indexes of the polynomial $\varphi_p(.)$.

In practice it is possible to construct $\varphi(\cdot)$ because we choose a control $u(\cdot)$ ourselves.

We will look for a stabilizing control $u = u(x)$ in form of polynomial in x.

Theorem 4.2 *For any domain $D, 0 \in intD$, the vector-polynomials $u(.)$ and $\varphi(.)$ can be chosen such that*
1) D is a region of asymptotic stability for the differential system (20);
2) the degree of $u(x)$ does not exceed the degree of the vector-polynomial $f(x,u)$ as a function of x;
3) the degree of $\varphi(.)$ is not bigger than the degree $f(.)$ as a function of $z = (x,u)$.

Proof. We will prove that a vector polynomial $u(x)$ can always be chosen satisfying the following conditions
1) the degree of $u(x)$ does not exceed the degree of the vector-polynomial $f(x,u)$ as a function of x;
2) $u(x)$ is a stabilizing control for (20) in the domain D.

We will use the results obtained before (Theorem 2.1).

Let us substitute in (20) the control $u = u(x)$ in the form of a vector-function of x. The system (20) is rewritten as

$$\dot{x} = \hat{f}(x) \tag{21}$$

or

$$\dot{x} = \hat{A}(x)x.$$

We can write conditions for the matrix $\hat{A}(x)$ to have the eigen-values with negative real parts.

There is no difficulty calculating the degree of the function $f(x,u)$ and the function $\varphi(u)$ as a function of x after substituting $u = u(x)$.

Let us denote by l_x and l_u the degrees of the function $f(x,u)$ in the variables x and u correspondently. Then after substituting $u = u(x)$ the degree of the function $f(.,.)$ as a function of x is not bigger than $l_x + l_u l_x$ and the degree of the function $\varphi(.)$ as a function of x is not bigger than $l_x(l_x + l_u)$. It is easy to see that

$$l_x + l_x l_u \leq l_x(l_x + l_u).$$

Having chosen the function $\varphi(\cdot)$, the coefficients of the vector polynomial $\hat{f}(x)$ can be chosen so that the matrix $\hat{A}(x)$ has the eigen-values with negative real parts. The theorem is proved. □

In an analogous way it can be proved the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3 *For the differential system (20) with even n the vector-polynomials $u(\cdot)$ and $\varphi(\cdot)$ can be chosen such that*
1) the origin of coordinates 0 is the center for the system (20);
2) the degree of $u(x)$ does not exceed the degree $f(x,u)$ as a function of x
3) the degree of $\varphi(.)$ is not bigger than the degree of $f(.)$ as a function of $z = (x,u)$.

This theorem can be used in physics of plasma specially for stabilization of plasma in reactor.

Remark 4.1 *In the case when the coefficients $a^{(p)}_{l_1,l_2,\ldots,l_n,m_1,m_2,\ldots,m_r}$ depend on t the coefficients $b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r}$ will depend on t as well. We can try to find these coefficients that the conditions of the theorems of the previous section were true for all $t > t_0$.*

5 One aspect of application

We will study for instance how to choose a control $u(\cdot)$ so that a given domain D consisting from the whole trajectories of a differential system were a region of asymptotic stability. For that we have to solve the following optimization problem.

Let us substitute a vector-control $u(\cdot)$ in a form of polynomial of x with a degree m not bigger than the degree of the the vector-polynomial $f(x,u)$ as a function of x in the equation (20) and rewrite (20) in the form (21). Denote the eigen-values of a matrix $\hat{A}(\cdot)$ in (21) by $\lambda_j(x, \alpha_{ij}, d^{(l)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_n}, b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r})$ where α_{ij} and $d^{(l)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots i_n}$ are the coefficients of the matrix $\hat{A}(\cdot)$ and the vector-function $u(\cdot)$ correspondingly, $b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r}$, $p \in 1:n$, are the coefficients of the vector-function $\varphi(.)$. Then our problem is reduced to the following optimization problem: to find out such continuous functions $\alpha_{ij}(x), i,j \in 1:n$, $x \in D$ and the numbers $d^{(l)}_{i_1,i_2,..,i_n}$, $b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r}$, $p \in 1:n$, that the following correlation

$$Re\, \lambda_j(x, \alpha_{ij}(x), d^{(l)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_n}, b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r}) < 0 \tag{22}$$

was true for all $x \in D, x \neq 0$, where $\alpha_{ij}(x), i, j \in 1:n$, are connected with each other by linear equations for each $x \in D, x \neq 0$, by other words we should solve the next problem

$$\inf_{\substack{d^{(l)}_{i_1,i_2,..,i_n}, l \in 1:r \\ b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,...,i_r},\, p \in 1:n}} \quad \sup_{\substack{j \in 1:n \\ x \in D \setminus B^n_\delta(0)}} \quad \inf_{c_{ij}} Re\, \lambda_j(x, \alpha_{ij}, d^{(l)}_{i_1,i_2,...,i_n}, b^{(p)}_{i_1,i_2,...,i_r}) < 0 \ \forall\, \delta > 0,$$

where $B^n_\delta(0) = \{z \in \Re^n \mid \parallel z \parallel \leq \delta\}, \delta-$ is any sufficient small number for which $D \supset B^n_\delta(0)$.

It is obvious that the inequalities (22) can be replaced by an equivalent system of inequalities for coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of the matrix $\hat{A}(.)$. To solve this system it is easier than to find the eigen-values of the marix $\hat{A}(.)$.

References

[1] Zubov V.I.(1975). The lectures on the control theory. *Nauka, Moscow*

[2] Zubov V.I.(1957). The Lyapunov's methods and their applications. *St.Petersburg University Press, St. Petersburg*

[3] Zubov V.I. (1962). Oscilations in nonlinear and controlled systems. *Shipbuilding Press, St. Petersburg*

[4] Krasovskiy N.N. (1970). The control theory of movement. *Nauka, Moscow*

arXiv:1204.1727v1 [math.OC] 8 Apr 2012

THE NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR REPRESENTING LIPSCHITZ BIVARIATE FUNCTIONS AS A DIFFERENCE OF TWO CONVEX FUNCTIONS

Igor Proudnikov

Russia, St.Petersburg University, pim_10@hotmail.com

Abstract In the article the necessary and sufficient conditions for a representation of Lipschitz function of two variables as a difference of two convex functions are formulated. An algorithm of this representation is given. The outcome of this algorithm is a sequence of pairs of convex functions that converge uniformly to a pair of convex functions if the conditions of the formulated theorems are satisfied. A geometric interpretation is also given.

Key words: Lipschitz functions, convex functions, variation of a function, curvature of a curve, turn of a curve.

1 Introduction

The solution to this problem is very interesting for the fields of optimization (for quasidifferential calculus [1]) and geometry. In [2] the author started to investigate the surfaces that are graphs of functions representing as a difference of two convex functions (so called RDC functions) to construct the inner geometry of such surfaces. This problem has been investigated by many authors (for example see [3] - [7]).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for such a representation of a function of one variable are well known. These conditions can be written in the following way.

Let be $x \to f(x) : [a, b] \to \Re$ a Lipschitz function. Define a set, where the function $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable, as N_f. Since the function $f(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz, N_f is the set of full measure on [a,b].

For the function $f(\cdot)$ to be represented as a difference of two convex functions it is necessary and sufficient that the following condition was true

$$sup_{\{x_i\} \subset N_f} \sum_i \mid f'(x_i) - f'(x_{i-1}) \mid \equiv \vee(f'; a, b) < \infty$$

where the derivatives are taken where they exist. The sign $\vee$ means the variation of the function f' on the segment [a,b].

In the article [7] the necessary and sufficient conditions for a representation of any one degree homogeneous Lipschitz function of three variables as a difference of two convex functions are given. This result can be extended to the m^{th} degree homogeneous functions.

I will now ignore the condition regarding to homogeneity and will consider any bivariate Lipschitz function $f(\cdot)$ with a Lipschitz constant L: $(x, y) \rightarrow f(x, y) : D \rightarrow \Re$ where D is an open bounded convex set in $\Re^2$ so that its closure $\bar{D}$ is compact. I will describe a representation with an algorithm giving a sequence of pairs of convex functions. These convex functions converge uniformly on D to a pair of convex functions if the conditions of the theorems formulated below are satisfied.

Let $\wp(D)$ be a class of curves on the plane XOY such that bound closed convex sets in the region D. Any curve $r \in \wp(D)$ will be written in the natural parametric representation i.e. the parameter τ of a point M on the curve $r(\cdot)$ is equal to the length of the curve $r(\cdot)$ between an initial point and the point M. I will denote such a curve by $r(t), t \in [0, T_r]$. With the help of the curves $r \in \wp(D)$ the necessary and sufficient conditions for a representation of the function $f(\cdot)$ as a difference of two convex functions can be written in the following way.

Theorem 1.1 *In order that a Lipschitz function $z \rightarrow f(z) : D \rightarrow \Re$ was represented as a difference of two convex functions it is necessary and sufficient that*

$$(\exists c(D, f) > 0)(\forall r \in \wp(D)) \quad \vee(\Phi'; 0, T_r) < c(D, f) \tag{1}$$

where $\Phi(t) = f(r(t)) \quad \forall t \in [0, T_r]$.

The algorithm of a representation of the function $f(\cdot)$ as a difference of convex functions is given and it is proved that the sum of the obtained functions converges if the condition of the theorem 1.1 is satisfied.

The proof is based on a special algorithm of a representation of the function $f(\cdot)$ as a difference of two convex functions. As the result we will get finite or infinite number of convex functions, which we will add together. It follows from the algorithm that the sum of the variations of the derivatives of these functions along any segment $[a, b] \subset D$ is finite, if (1) is satisfied, and, consequently, the sum of the convex functions, obtained from the algorithm, is bounded above.

For a representation of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ as a difference of two convex functions I will use two operations, which give us an opportunity to produce finite or infinite number of functions with bounded connected supports. According to the definition, a continuous function with bounded connected support is a continuous function such that is not equal to zero only on an open bounded connected set $Q \subset D$ and equal to zero on the set $D \backslash Q$. The closure of the set Q is called the support of this function. A function with such support is called a finite function.

I will denote the set of all finite functions on D by $\Im$.

The first operation is a construction of a maximum convex function that does not exceed the initial one at all points of the set D. Using this operation in iterative way and subtracting from the initial one the obtained convex function I will get finite functions with supports $D_i,\ D_i \subset D$. After obtaining a finite function at some step I will apply to it again the construction of a maximum convex function on the convex hull coD_i of its support. After that I will subtract from the maximum convex function the finite function, for which this maximum convex function was constructed, and will obtain new finite functions with supports $D_{ij} \subset coD_i$ and so on. It will be proved that the obtained finite functions will trend to zero on the norm in $C(D)$ uniformly regarding to the step of iteration.

The operation of the construction of the maximum convex function that does not exceed the initial function is the similar to the operation that was used by B.A.Zalgaller in [5]. He investigated possibility of a representation of some special kind of a function as a difference of two convex functions.

The second operation is an extraction of finite functions, obtained at the previous step, that are convex on their supports $\operatorname{co} D_i,\ \operatorname{co} D_i \subset D,$. My goal is to represent each of them as the sum of convex and concave functions defined on D. When the condition of the theorem 1.1 holds the sum of the obtained convex functions is bounded above by some constant on the set D.

I will call functions, represented as a difference of convex functions, RDC functions, according to the terminology in [2].

2 The Proof of the Theorem

We will start the Proof of the Theorem from a description of the Algorithm.

2.1 The algorithm of a representation of a function as a difference between two convex functions

I will construct a maximum convex function $(x, y) \to f_1(x, y) : D \to \Re$ satisfying the inequality $f_1(x, y) \leq f(x, y)$. The function $f_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz with the constant L as soon as all its generalized gradients [8] are the gradients of the function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ at some points where the graphs Γ_f and Γ_{f_1} of the functions $f(\cdot)$ and $f_1(\cdot)$ respectively touch each other.

Using the extraction operation of finite functions from the difference $f_1(\cdot, \cdot) - f(\cdot, \cdot)$, we can construct the finite functions $(x, y) \to f_{1,i_1}(x, y) : D \to \Re$ with their supports $D_{1,i_1} \subset D,\ i_1 \in I_1 \subset N$ (see fig.1). The sets $D_{1,i_1},\ i_1 \in I_1$, are not necessarily convex and can have the common points on the boundaries, and also possibly that I_1 is an infinite set of indices. The sum of the functions $f_{1,i_1}(\cdot, \cdot)$ on i_1 is $f_1(\cdot, \cdot) - f(\cdot, \cdot)$. If the sets D_{1,i_1} are not convex, then I will obtain at the following step the convex functions on $\operatorname{co} D_{1,i_1}$, $i_1 \in I_1$, by using the operation of construction of maximum convex function. The sets $\operatorname{co} D_{1,i_1},\ i_1 \in I_1$, can have the common inner points. It will be proved below that $f_{1,i_1}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Lipschitz function with the constant 2L.

Our goal is to represent $f_{1,i_1}(\cdot, \cdot)$ as a difference of two convex functions on D. If $f_{1,i_1}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is convex on its supports coD_{1,i_1} then it can be extended to D in the following way (see [1], p. 118)

$$\tilde{f}_{1,i_1}(z) = \max_{\substack{v \in \partial f_{1,i_1}(\bar{z}), \\ \bar{z} \in coD_{1,i_1}}} (f_{1,i_1}(\bar{z}) + (v, z - \bar{z})),$$

where $z = (x, y), \bar{z} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \partial f_{1,i_1}(\bar{z})$ is the subdifferential of the function $f_{1,i_1}(\cdot, \cdot)$ at the point $\bar{z}$, as it is shown in [1]. The function $\tilde{f}_{1,i_1}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the maximum of the linear functions, consequently, it is convex [8].

We can see that the difference

$$\bar{f}_{1,i_1}(z) = \tilde{f}_{1,i_1}(z) - f_{1,i_1}(z) \ \ \forall z \in D$$

is the convex function that is equal to zero on $\operatorname{co} D_{1,i_1}$. From here

$$f_{1,i_1}(z) = \tilde{f}_{1,i_1}(z) - \bar{f}_{1,i_1}(z) \ \ \forall z \in D,$$

what was required to prove.

If $f_{1,i_1}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not convex on D_{1,i_1} then I will construct a maximum convex function $(x,y) \to f_{2,i_1}(x,y) : \operatorname{co} D_{1,i_1} \to R$ on $\operatorname{co} D_{1,i_1}$ satisfying the inequality

$$f_{2,i_1}(x,y) \leq f_{1,i_1}(x,y) \ \ \forall (x,y) \in \operatorname{co} D_{1,i_1}.$$

The function $f_{2,i_1}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is Lipschitz with the constant 2L on D as all its generalized gradients are the generalized gradients of the function $f_{1,i_1}(\cdot,\cdot)$. The function $f_{2,i_1}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not equal to zero on $\operatorname{int} D_{2,i_1} = \operatorname{int} \operatorname{co} D_{1,i_1}$. Therefore the function $f_{2,i_1}(\cdot,\cdot)$ can be represented in the same way as shown previously with respect to the difference of two convex functions on D:

$$f_{2,i_1}(z) = \tilde{f}_{2,i_1}(z) - \hat{f}_{2,i_1}(z) \ \ \forall z \in D, z = (x,y).$$

The difference $f_{2,i_1}(z) - f_{1,i_1}(z), z \in D$, is a Lipschitz function with the constant 2L and it will be proved later. The function $f_{2,i_1}(z) - f_{1,i_1}(z)$ can be represented as the sum of the functions $z \to f_{2,i_1,i_2}(z) : D \to R$ with the supports $D_{2,i_1,i_2}, i_2 \in I_2$, respectively. In the general case the set I_2 is an infinite set. Clearly that $D_{2,i1,i2} \subset \operatorname{co} D_{1,i_1}$.

I will continue the described process further in the following way.

The function $(x,y) \to f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots i_k}(x,y) : D \to R$, that has been constructed at the k-th step has supports $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots i_k} \subset \operatorname{co} D_{k-1,i_1,i_2,\ldots.i_{k-1}}$. This function is defined on D and Lipschitz with the constant 2L. The set $D_{k,i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k} \subset D$ is its supports i.e. the closure of the bounded open connected set of the points where $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not equal to zero. The function $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is equal to zero at other points that are not elements of the set $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots i_k}$. All sets $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots.i_k}$ are obtained during the described above process. It is possible that there is an infinite number of these sets.

Description of the algorithm

1. If at the k+1 - th step for some $i_1, i_2, \ldots i_k$ the function $f_{k,i_1,i_2 \ldots i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not convex on its support $D_{k,i_1 i_2 \ldots. i_k}$, I construct a maximal convex function $(x,y) \to f_{k+1,i_1,i_2 \ldots i_k}(x,y) : \operatorname{co} D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k} \to R$ satisfying the inequality

$$f_{k+1,i_1,i_2 \ldots i_k}(x,y) \leq f_{k,i_1,i_2 \ldots i_k}(x,y) \ \ \forall (x,y) \in \operatorname{co} D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}.$$

The function $f_{k+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is equal to zero at other points that are not elements of the set $\operatorname{co} D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots i_k}$.

2. Let us define the difference

$$f_{k+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(x,y)-f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(x,y)\ \ \forall(x,y)\in D.$$

I will represent it as the sum of finite functions, which I denoted by $(x,y)\to f_{k+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k+1}}(x,y):D\to R$ with bounded supports denoted by $D_{k+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k+1}}\subset coD_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}$.

3. I then let k=k+1 and repeat the process again. In the general case the described process can give an infinite sequence of the finite functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot), k\in N$. According to the algorithm I have

$$f(\cdot,\cdot)=f_1(\cdot,\cdot)-\sum_{i_1}f_{1,i_1}(\cdot,\cdot),$$

$$f_{1,i_1}(\cdot,\cdot)=f_{2,i_1}-\sum_{i_1,i_2}f_{2,i_1,i_2}(\cdot,\cdot),$$

$$f_{2,i_1,i_2}(\cdot,\cdot)=f_{3,i_1,i_2}(\cdot,\cdot)-\sum_{i_1,i_2,i_3}f_{3,i_1,i_2,i_3}(\cdot,\cdot).$$

Continuing the expansion process we will have

$$f(\cdot,\cdot)=f_1(\cdot,\cdot)+\sum_{k=1}^{t}(-1)^k\sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots i_k}f_{k+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)+(-1)^{t+1}\sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{t+1}}f_{t+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{t+1}}(\cdot,\cdot). \tag{2}$$

I will show that all functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are Lipschitz with the constant 2L. For that it is sufficient to show that all generalized gradients of the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are limited on the norm by the constant 2L.

I begin the proof with one-dimensional case.

At the first step after subtraction of the maximum convex function $f_1(\cdot)$ from the function $f(\cdot)$ the gradients of an obtained function are equal to $g_1-f(x)$. The gradient g_2 of the linear function (see the fig.2) becomes equal to g_1-g_2. It is obvious that

$$\| g_1-\nabla f(x)\|\leq 2L,$$

as g_1 is a generalized gradient of the function $f(\cdot)$ and $\| g_1\|\leq L$.

At the second step we get a finite function with the gradients

$$(g_1-g_2)-(g_1-\nabla f(x))=\nabla f(x)-g_2$$

in the region D_2 and with the norm not bigger than 2L as far as $\| g_2\|\leq L$. After two operations the gradient of a linear function in the region D_3 is equal to

$$(g_1-g_2)-(g_1-g_3)=g_3-g_2.$$

At the third step the gradients of an obtained finite function are equal to

$$(g_3-g_2)-(g_1-g_2)+(g_1-\nabla f(x))=g_3-\nabla f(x),$$

in the region D_3 that is not bigger than 2L on the norm.

We can continue our process further. Consequently, the gradients of all finite functions at each step are not bigger than 2L on the norm.

In two-dimensional case the functions $f_{k+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ can not be linear in the regions $D_{k+1,i_1i_2\ldots.i_{k+1}}$. We can always approach the function $f(\cdot)$ with the help of a piecewise linear function with any given precision and prove that all generalized gradients of the piecewise linear functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are limited on the norm by the constant 2L.

Since any Lipschitz function $f(\cdot)$ can be approached by piecewise function with gradients of linear parts not bigger on the norm than $L+\mu$ where μ is any small positive number, it is necessary to follow how the gradients of linear functions change. We can see from computations, given above, that the gradients of the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are equal to $\pm g_k \mp \nabla f(\cdot)$ where g_k are the gradients of linear functions in the regions $D_{k+1,i_1i_2\ldots.i_{k+1}}$. It follows from here that the gradients of the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are not bigger $2L$ on the norm. It is not difficult to prove it by the mathematical induction.

I will prove that our process of the construction of the maximum convex functions that do not exceed the initial functions on their supports $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}$, will not stop while there are some points $a, b \in D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}$ with the different values of the function $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ at the step k. Our process strives to make equal all values of the function $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ at all points of its support.

This statement can be proved by the contraposition method.

Consider at each step k the biggest deviation of the function $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ from zero. I will denote this by h_k and the points where this deviation occurs by $(x_k, y_k) \in D$. Since $\bar{D}$ is the compact set, the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k)\}$ has a limit $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \bar{D}$. I have already proved that the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are Lipschitz with the constant 2L. There are the points from D in any small neighborhood of the point $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ where the values of the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are equal to zero and, consequently, differ from each other on the constant $\mid h_k \mid \geq h > 0$ that contradicts the hypothesis of $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots.i_k}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are Lipschitz with the constant 2L.

Consequently, when $k \to \infty$

$$f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(x,y) \to 0 \ \ \forall (x,y) \in D$$

uniformly on k.

Moreover, all functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}$ go to zero uniformly on k. This statement can be proved by contraposition in analogous manner like above. In the opposite case we would get a contradiction with uniform Lipschitz quality what can be seen from the previous considerations.

From the algorithm and (2) it follows that the sum

$$\sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k+1}} f_{k+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k+1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$$

of the finite functions received at the k+1-th step also tends to zero when $k \to \infty$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ a big number $k(\varepsilon) \in N$ exists that

$$\mid f(x,y) - f_1(x,y) - \sum_{k=1}^{k(\varepsilon)} (-1)^k \sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k} f_{k+1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}(x,y) \mid \leq \varepsilon \ \ \forall (x,y) \in D.$$

It is clear that $k(\varepsilon) \to \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to +0$.

Let us take any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and stop our process at the step $k(\varepsilon)$. I will represent all finite functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ for $1 \leq k \leq k(\varepsilon)$ as a difference of convex functions in the following way.

Let us define the function [1]

$$\tilde{f}_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) = \max_{\substack{v \in \partial f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\bar{z}) \\ \bar{z} \in coD_{1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}}} (f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\bar{z}) + (v, z - \bar{z})),$$

where $z = (x,y) \in \Re^2, \bar{z} = (\bar{x},\bar{y})$ and $\partial f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\bar{z})$ is the subdifferential (see [1], [8]) of the function $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\bar{z})$ at the point $\bar{z}$. The function $\tilde{f}_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a convex function, because it is the maximum of the linear functions [1], [8].

It is clear that the difference

$$\bar{f}_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) = \tilde{f}_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) - f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) \ \ \forall z \in D$$

is a convex function equal to zero on $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}$. From here I have

$$f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) = \tilde{f}_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) - \bar{f}_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) \ \ \forall z \in D.$$

The proof is completed.

I will obtain the necessary and sufficient conditions when the sums

$$\sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}^{k(\varepsilon)} \tilde{f}_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) \tag{3}$$

and

$$\sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}^{k(\varepsilon)} \bar{f}_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(z) \tag{4}$$

are bounded by a constant that does not depend on $\varepsilon, z = (x,y) \in D$.

Let us take any $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$. Let

$$\Phi(t) = f(r(t)) \ \ \forall t \in [0, T_r],$$

where $r(.)$ is written in the natural parametric representation. The parameter T_r is the length of the loop $r(.)$.

I will prove that $\Phi(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz with the constant L. In fact for any $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T_r]$ I have

$$\mid \Phi(t_1) - \Phi(t_2) \mid = \mid f(r(t_1)) - f(r(t_2)) \mid \leq L\|r(t_1) - r(t_2)\| \leq L \mid t_1 - t_2 \mid .$$

Therefore [9] $\Phi(\cdot)$ is almost everywhere differentiable in $[0, T_r]$. I will define by N_r the set of the points where the function $\Phi(\cdot)$ is differentiable in $[0, T_r]$.

I will prove that for any curve $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$ there is a constant $c(D) > 0$ such that

$$\vee(\Phi'; 0, T_r) < c(D). \tag{5}$$

Then the summations (3) and (4) are bounded on module by some constant that does not depend on $\varepsilon > 0$. Since the function $f(\cdot)$ is continuous on D, it is sufficient to prove that one of the summations, (3) or (4), is bounded.

The proof will be based on the following Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 2.1 . *The inequality*

$$\vee(\Theta'; 0, T_r) < c_1(D, \psi)$$

is true for any convex positively homogeneous functions with the degree 1 $q \to \psi(q) : \Re^2 \to \Re$ *and for any* $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$ *where* $\Theta(t) = \psi(r(t))$ *for any* $t \in [0, T_r], c_1(D, \psi)$ *is a constant.*

Proof. Without loss of generality I will consider that $\psi(\cdot)$ is a smooth function in $\Re^2$ $\{0\}$ and $\{0\} \in D$. Let

$$\psi(r(t)) = \max{}_{v \in \partial\psi(0)}(v, r(t)) = (v(t), r(t)), \;\; v(t) \in \partial\psi(0),$$

where $\partial\psi(0)$ is the subdifferential of the function $\psi(\cdot)$ at the initial point. As well I will consider that $r(.)$ is a differentiable on t function. As soon as $r(t)$ is the support vector of the set $\partial\psi(0)$ at the point $v(t)$, we have $(v'(t), r(t)) = 0$.

I have

$$\mid \psi'(r(t_1)) - \psi'(r(t_2)) \mid = \mid (v(t_1), r'(t_1)) - (v(t_2), r'(t_2)) \mid = \mid (v(t_1) - v(t_2), r'(t_1)) +$$

$$(v(t_2), r'(t_1)) - (v(t_2), r'(t_2)) \mid \le \|v(t_1) - v(t_2)\| \; \|r'(t_1)\| + \|r'(t_1) - r'(t_2)\| \; \|v(t_2\| \le$$

$$\|v(t_1) - v(t_2)\| + L(D) \mid t_1 - t_2 \mid .$$

Here we took into consideration that $\|r'(t)\| = 1$.

It follows from here that

$$\vee(\Theta'; 0, T_r) < 2P(\partial\psi(0)) + L(D)T_r,$$

where $P(\psi(0))$ is the length of the curve bounding the convex set $\partial\psi(0) \subset \Re^2$ and L(D) is the Lipschitz constant of the function $\psi(\cdot)$. Since all terms in the right side depend only on the set D and some constants, Lemma 1 is proved. □

Lemma 2.2 *Let* $(x, y) \to f_1(x, y) : \Re^2 \to \Re$ *be a continuous convex function and* $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D), t \in [0, T_r]$. *Then there is a constant* $c_2(D, f_1) > 0$ *such that*

$$\vee(\Phi_1'; 0, T_r) \le c_2(D, f_1) \tag{6}$$

where $\Phi_1(t) = f_1(r(t)), t \in [0, T_r]$.

Proof. Without loss of generality I will assume that $f_1(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not negative on D, the initial point is the minimal point and also $0 = (0,0)$ belongs to the interior of the convex region in $\Re^2$ with the boundary $r(\cdot)$. I will construct an homogeneous function $\psi(\cdot)$ with the degree one, i.e. $\psi(\lambda x, \lambda y) = \lambda\psi(x,y), \lambda > 0$, with values $f_1(r(\cdot))$ on the curve $r(\cdot)$. I will prove that $\psi(\cdot)$ is the convex function.

Let us consider the function

$$f_\varepsilon(x,y) = f_1(x,y) + \varepsilon(\| x \|^2 + \| y \|^2), \varepsilon > 0.$$

I will divide the segment $[0, T_r]$ into equal segments using division points $\{t_i\}, i \in 1 : J$, and build the planes π_i in $\Re^3$ containing the points $(0,0,0), (r(t_i), f_\varepsilon(r(t_i)))$, $(r(t_{i+1}), f_\varepsilon(r(t_{i+1}))), i \in 1 : J$. The parts of the planes $\pi_i, i \in 1 : J$, are defined in their sectors $(0,0), (0, r(t_i)), (0, r(t_{i+1})$ and built with the help of the vectors $(0,0,0), (r(t_i), f_\varepsilon(r(t_i)))$, $(r(t_{i+1}), f_\varepsilon(r(t_{i+1})))$. They define a homogeneous many-sided function $(\psi_\varepsilon)_J(r(\cdot))$ (refer [3],[7]). I will prove that all two-sided angles defined by the planes $\pi_i, i \in J$, of the function $(\psi_\varepsilon)_J(\cdot,\cdot)$ are convex.

Since any curve $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$ can be approached by a smooth curve from $\wp(D)$, without loss of generality we can assume that $r(\cdot)$ is a smooth curve with the derivative $r'(\cdot)$.

Let us define the gradients of the planes π_i and π_{i+1} by $\nabla\pi_i$ and $\nabla\pi_{i+1}$ respectively. I will use the theorem about midpoint according to which there is a point $t_m \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ such that

$$\partial f_\varepsilon(r(t_m))/\partial e_i = (\nabla\pi_i, e_i),$$

where

$$e_i = (r(t_{i+1}) - r(t_i))/ \| r(t_{i+1}) - r(t_i) \| = r'(t_m).$$

Similarly for the plane π_{i+1} and some point $t_c \in [t_{i+1}, t_{i+2}]$ I have

$$\partial f_\varepsilon(r(t_c))/\partial e_{i+1} = (\nabla\pi_{i+1}, e_{i+1}),$$

where

$$e_{i+1} = (r(t_{i+2}) - r(t_{i+1}))/ \| r(t_{i+2}) - r(t_{i+1}) \| = r'(t_c).$$

The function $f_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ has a positive definite matrix of the second derivatives. Consequently, according to the well-known qualities of convex functions (see, [1]) for sufficient big J and uniform subdivision of the curve $r(\cdot)$ by points t_i we have

$$\partial f_\varepsilon(r(t_m))/\partial e_i < \partial f_\varepsilon(r(t_c))/\partial e_{i+1},$$

or

$$(\nabla\pi_i, e_i) < (\nabla\pi_{i+1}, e_{i+1}).$$

Let us note that the difference $\nabla\pi_{i+1} - \nabla\pi_i$ is perpendicular to the vector $r(t_{i+1})$. From here and the inequality written above it follows that all two-sided angles π_i, π_{i+1} are convex. For $J \to \infty$ we have the uniform convergence $(\psi_\varepsilon)_J(\cdot) \Rightarrow (\psi_\varepsilon)(\cdot)$ on D.

As soon as the pointwise limit is equivalent to the uniform limit, then $\psi_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is the convex function. Also we have the uniform convergence $\psi_\varepsilon(\cdot) \Rightarrow \psi(\cdot)$ when $\varepsilon \to +0$, i.e. $\psi(\cdot)$ is convex on D as well.

It is obvious that the gradients of the linear functions with the graphs $\pi_i, i \in J$, are bounded by a constant depending only on the region D and the function $f_1(\cdot,\cdot)$ and

$$\psi(r(t)) = f_1(r(t)) \ \ \forall t \in [0, T_r].$$

It is obvious that $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)$ was built correctly with the help of the function $f_1(\cdot,\cdot)$ and the chosen curve $r(\cdot)$. It follows from above that the function $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)$ is Lipschitz with a constant L(D, f).

Let

$$\Psi_1(t) = \psi(r(t)) \ \ \forall t \in [0, T_r].$$

Since

$$\vee(\Phi_1'; 0, T_r) = \vee(\Psi_1'; 0, T_r),$$

it follows from the Lemma 2.1 that

$$\vee(\Phi_1'; 0, T_r) \le c_2(D, f_1).$$

Hence the Lemma 2.2 is proved. □

It follows from the Lemma 2 that if $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is represented as a difference of two convex functions i.e.

$$f(z) = f_1(z) - f_2(z) \quad \forall z \in D$$

where $f_i(\cdot,\cdot), i = 1, 2$, are convex functions then the inequality (6) is true by necessity. In fact, I will introduce for any $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$ the following notations

$$\Psi_1(t) = f_1(r(t)), \Psi_2(t) = f_2(r(t)) \quad \forall t \in [0, T_r].$$

Since

$$\vee(\Phi'; 0, T_r) \le \vee(\Phi_1'; 0, T_r) + \vee(\Phi_2'; 0, T_r)$$

the inequalities (5) and (6) are true by necessity [9].

I will prove, for instance, that the sum

$$\sum_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{k-1}}^{k(\varepsilon)} \tilde{f}_{k, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$$

is bounded by some constant on D independently from ε where $k(\varepsilon) \to \infty$ with $\varepsilon \to +0$ (in general case) when (5) is true for any curve $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$.

I will introduce the functions for any $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{k, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{k-1}}(t) = \tilde{f}_{k, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{k-1}}(r(t)) \quad \forall t \in [0, T_r], \quad \forall k,$$

$$\Phi_{k, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{k-1}}(t) = f_{k, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{k-1}}(r(t)) \quad \forall t \in [0, T_r], \quad \forall k.$$

I will prove the inequality

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k(\varepsilon)} \vee(\Phi'_{k, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{k-1}}; 0, T_r) < C_1 \tag{7}$$

for any small $\varepsilon > 0$.Here C_1 does not depend on ε.

In one-dimensional case the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ will be linear in regions where they do not coincide with $f_{k-1,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$. Therefore the sum of variations of derivatives of the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ do not exceed the same variation of the function $f(\cdot)$.

I two-dimensional case the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ can not be linear in regions where they do not coincide with $f_{k-1,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$. For this reason the sum of variations of derivatives of the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ can be greater than the same variation of the function $f(\cdot)$. I will prove that the total increase on k will be bounded above.

The proof will be done from the contrary in the same way how boundedness of (3) was proved from (5). I will take segments a_k in the regions $D_{k-1,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{i-1}}$, where $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ do not coincide with $f_{k-1,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$, along which variations v_k of derivatives of $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are maximal. But v_k are not greater than variations of $f(\cdot)$ along some segments from $D_{k-1,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{i-1}}$. If the sum of v_k is not bounded above, then we can find out a curve or a sequence of curves from $\wp(D)$ along which variations of derivatives of $f(\cdot)$ are not bounded above. It contradicts (5).Consequently, (7) is proved.

I will suggest the contraposition. Namely, let the inequality (7) be true but the sum (3) is not bounded on D when $\varepsilon \to +0$.

I will choose for every function $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ a direction along that the variation of the derivative of the considered function $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is maximal. I will prove that the constant C_1 not depending on ε in (7) does not exist for our suggestion.

Let us denote by $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k_1}}$ a segment of the region $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{i-1}}$ along that the variation of the derivatives of the function $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is maximum among all segments of the region $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{i-1}}$.

Let us make the following procedure. Dividing the region D into convex compact subregions I will choose such a subregion where the function $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not represented as a difference of two convex functions. Furthermore I will divide the chosen subregion into smaller subregions and chose one of these smaller subregions where the function $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not RDC function. I continue this process until I obtain a point M such that the function $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not RDC in a neighborhood of the point M. Further I will divide the set D into sectors that have a common point M, and choose a sector, where the function $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not RDC function. The set of the chosen sectors shrinks to a ray l with the summit at the point M. It is obvious that the function $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not RDC in any cone K with the summit at the point M if $l \in intK$.

From the procedure described above I will produce one of the following two situations:

a) the sum (3) has the infinite variation along the direction l when $\varepsilon \to +0$;

b) the sum (3) has the infinite variation when $\varepsilon \to +0$ along the direction η that is perpendicular to the direction l.

The cases a) and b) mean that the infinite sum (3) of the convex functions is an unbounded convex function in the directions l or η correspondently.

Consider the case a). Take any cone K with non-empty interior and $l \in intK$. I will consider the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ with the supports $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}$ from the cone K. Let the slope angles between the segments $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}$ and the direction l for large k do not exceed $\pi/2 - \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then I will choose a subgroup of the segments $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}$ that can be intersected by a curve $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$ that has the slopes at the points of intersections with the segments $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}$ not exceeding $\pi/2-\delta, \delta>0$. Since the cone K is arbitrary and contains the ray l I can assume that $r'(t)\to l$ when $t\to T_r$.

As soon as all functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ are Lipschitz uniformly, their variations of the derivatives along a segments s_k that is close to the segment $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}$ will be close to each other as well. The curve $r(.)$ will consist of the segments s_k in the regions $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}$.

Let a curve $r(\cdot)\in\wp(D)$ exist along that the variation of the derivative of the sum (3) increases to infinity when $\varepsilon\to+0$ (refer to the fig.3). (It is possible the case when the regions $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}$ include each other but it does not change the discussion). I obtain the contradiction with the inequality (5).

The case is possible when I have several groups of the segments $\{I_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}\}_i$ and for each of these groups a curve $r_i(\cdot)\in\wp(D)$ exists that

$$\vee(\Phi'_{r_i};0,T_{r_i})=c_i,\;\; r'_i(t)\to l$$

when $t\to T_{r_i}$, t is the natural parameter, and

$$\sum_i c_i=\infty$$

where $\Phi_{r_i}(\cdot)$ is the value of the infinite sum (3) for $\varepsilon\to+0$ on the curve $r_i(\cdot)$.

I will build a curve $r(\cdot)\in\wp(D)$ for this case in the following way.

The curve $r(\cdot)$ has to consist of enough number of segments from each group (or close to them) so that

$$\vee(\Phi'_{r_i};t_{r_i},t_{r_{i+1}})=c_i-\varepsilon_i$$

where t_{r_i} is the value of the parameter t for the i-th group of the segments for the natural parametric representation of the curve $r_i(\cdot)$, ε_i is a positive number so that

$$\sum_i \varepsilon_i=\varepsilon.$$

It is obvious that such a curve $r(\cdot)$ can be always built. It will consist from the curves $r_i(\cdot)$. For that it is necessary to do smooth passage from one curve $r_i(\cdot)$ to another $r(\cdot)$ without going out of the set $\wp(D)$. Since $r'_i(t)\to l$ for $t\to T_r$ and all i, this procedure can be always done. But then

$$\vee(\Phi'_r;0,T_r)\ge\sum_i\vee(\Phi'_{r_i};0,T_{r_i})=\sum_i(c_i-\varepsilon_i)=\sum_i c_i-\sum_i\varepsilon_i=\infty.$$

where $\Phi_r(\cdot)$ is a value of the infinite sum (3) for $\varepsilon\to+0$ on the curve $r(\cdot)$.

As soon as, according to the algorithm, the sum of the variations (7) along any segment of the curve $r(\cdot)\in\wp(D)$ is equal to the variation of the initial function along the same segment, then we have

$$\vee(\Phi';0,T_r)=\infty$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is calculated at the constructed curve $r(\cdot)$ that contradicts (5).

If the angles of the slopes of the segments $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}$ with the ray l go to $\pi/2$ when $k \to \infty$, then the variation of the sum (3) is infinite in the direction η when $\varepsilon \to +0$ (the case b).

Let us consider the case b).

We will construct the curve $r_m(.)$ from the segments $\bar{s}_k$ in the regions $D_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}$.

All the segments $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}$ can be divided into such groups $\{m\}$ of segments that can be intersected by a curve $r_m(.) \in \wp(D)$ for that

$$r'_m(\tau) \to_{\tau \to T_r} l,$$

where T_{r_m} is a parameter of the curve $r_m(.)$ for the natural parametrization at the point M. The curvatures of the curves $r_m(.)$ tend to infinity when $\tau \to T_{r_m}$. Obviously, it can be always done by dividing the set of the segments $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}$ into the subsets with required qualities (refer to the fig. 4).

Moreover, the angles α_{k_m}, the curves $r_m(.)$ and the groups of the segments $\{I_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k_1}}\}_m$ can be chosen in such a way that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \vee(\Phi'_{r_m}; 0, T_{r_m}) = \infty. \tag{8}$$

The construction of the curves $r_m(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$, for that (8) is true, is fulfilled in the same way as in the case a). For that it is necessary to intersect by the curve $r_m(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$ enough number of segments from each group that

$$\vee(\Phi'_{r_m}; t_{r_m}, t_{r_{m+1}}) = c_m$$

and

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} c_m = \infty,$$

where $[t_{r_m}, t_{r_{m+1}}]$ is the segment of values of t of the natural parametric representation for the m -th group of the segments. We can always construct such a curve $r_m(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$.

The inequality written above will be satisfied as soon as

1. Increasing the curvatures of the curves at the point M the curves $r_m(\cdot)$ cross an increasing number of segments $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k_1}}$ for $m \to \infty$ with acute angles $\alpha_m > 0$.

2. A number of segments is infinite in any cone K with the vertex M and the inner vector l.

3. The sum of projections of their lengths in the direction η is infinite.

The described procedure gives the finite functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\dots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$. The sum of the variations of the derivatives of these functions along the segments $\bar{s}_k$ of the curve $r(.)$ is equal to the variation of derivatives of the function $\Phi(t) = f(r(t))$ along the same segments. As a result we have

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \vee(\Phi'; 0, T_{r_m}) = \infty,$$

where $\Phi(.)$ is calculated along the constructed curves $r_m(.)$. We come again to the contradiction with (5).

Two operations described above in this paper allow us to come to finite or countable number of the finite functions from $\Im$ as long as the maximums of the modules of the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ go to zero in D when $k \to \infty$. Since the sum of the variations of the derivatives of the functions $f_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ along any segment from D is bounded above by the constant $c(D, f)$, Theorem 1 is proved. $\Box$

Remark 2.1 *The arguments about the chosen angles α_{k_m} and the curves $r_m(.)$ are analogous to the following.*

Let us have the divergent series

$$\sum_i a_i = \infty, \quad a_i > 0 \quad \forall i.$$

We can always choose a decreasing sequence $\{\beta_i\}, \beta_i \to_{i\to\infty} 0$, that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_i \, a_i = \infty.$$

Here a_i is the analogue of the variation of derivatives along a segment $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}$ and β_i is the analogue of the cosine of an angle between a curve r_i and a segment $I_{k,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{k-1}}$ at the point of intersections.

3 Geometric interpretation of the theorem 1

I will give another geometrical interpretation of the Theorem 1. Let me introduce a turn of the curve $r(\cdot)$ on the graph $\Gamma_f = \{(x, y, z) \in \Re^3 \mid z = f(x, y)\}$.

Consider on Γ_f the curve $R(t) = (r(t), f(r(t)))$ where $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$. As the function $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is Lipschitz, the derivative $R'(\cdot)$ exists almost everywhere on $[0, T_r]$, which I will denote by $\tau(\cdot) = R'(\cdot)$.

Definition 3.1 *The turn of the curve $R(\cdot)$ on the manifold Γ_f is called the value*

$$sup_{\{t_i\}\subset N_r} \sum_i \| \frac{\tau(t_i)}{\|\tau(t_i)\|} - \frac{\tau(t_{i-1})}{\|\tau(t_{i-1})\|} \| = O_r$$

Thus the turn O_r of the curve $R(\cdot)$ is the supremum of the sum of all angles between the tangents $\tau(t)$ for $t \in [0, T_r]$. It is obvious that the value O_r is equal to the integral

$$\int_0^{T_r} \mid k(s) \mid ds$$

for any flat curve $r(\cdot)$ represented in the natural parametric way where $k(s)$ is the curvature of the curve $r(\cdot)$ at the point $s \in [0, T_r]$ i.e. in this case this definition coincides with the usual definition of the turn of the curve [10] .

Theorem 3.1 . *For any Lipschitz function $z \to f(z) : D \to R$ to be RDC function on the compact set $D \in \Re^2$ it is necessary and sufficient that a constant $c_2(D, f) > 0$ exists for all $r(\cdot) \in \wp(D)$ such that the turn of the curve $R(\cdot)$ on the Γ_f was bounded by the constant $c_2(D, f) > 0$ depending only on D (and the function f) i.e.*

$$O_r \leq c_2(D, f) \quad \forall r \in \wp(D). \tag{9}$$

Proof.Necessity. Let $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ be a RDC function. I will prove that the inequality (9) is true in this case. Let us use the inequality following from the triangle inequality

$$\|\tau(t_i)/\|\tau(t_i)\| - \tau(t_{i-1})/\|\tau(t_{i-1}\|\| \leq \|r'(t_i)/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_i))} - r'(t_{i-1})/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_{i-1}))}\| +$$

$$\mid f_t'(r(t_i))/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_i))} - f_t'(r(t_{i-1}))/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_{i-1}))} \mid .$$

Since $1 \leq \sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_i))} \leq \sqrt{1 + L^2}$ for all $t_i \in [0, T_r]$, it is obvious that the number $c_3 > 1$ exists, for that the inequality

$$\|r'(t_i)/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_i))} - r'(t_{i-1})/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_{i-1}))}\| \leq c_3\|r'(t_i) - r'(t_{i-1})\| \tag{10}$$

is true. The inequality

$$\mid f_t'(r(t_i))/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_i))} - f_t'(r(t_{i-1}))/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_{i-1}))} \mid \leq \mid f_t'(r(t_i)) - f_t'(r(t_{i-1})) \mid \tag{11}$$

follows from properties of the function $\theta(x) = x/\sqrt{1 + x^2}$. We have from (10) and (11)

$$\sup_{\{t_i\} \in N_r} \sum_i \|\tau(t_i)/\|\tau(t_i)\| - \tau(t_{i-1})/\|\tau(t_{i-1})\|\|\| \leq c_3(\vee(\|r'\|; 0, T_r) + \vee(\Phi'; 0, T_r)). \tag{12}$$

Since the function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is RDC, the inequality

$$\vee(\Phi'; 0, T_r) \leq c_1(D)$$

is true according to Theorem 1. The inequality (9) follows from the inequality shown above and from (12). The necessity is proved.

Sufficiency. Let the inequality (9) be true. I will prove that $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the RDC function. I will use the inequality

$$\|\tau(t_i)/\|\tau(t_i)\| - \tau(t_{i-1})/\|\tau(t_{i-1})\|\|\| \geq \mid f_t'(r(t_i))/\sqrt{1 + f_t'(r(t_i))} - f_t'(r(t_{i-1}))/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_{i-1}))}. \tag{13}$$

From the qualities of the function $\theta(x) = x/\sqrt{1 + x^2}$ and from the inequality $\|f'(z)\| \leq L$ for $z \in D$ it follows the existence of a constant $c_4(L) > 0$, for that

$$\mid f_t'(r(t_i))/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_i))} - f_t'(r(t_{i-1}))/\sqrt{1 + f_t'^2(r(t_{i-1}))} \geq c_4 \mid f_t'(r(t_i)) - f_t'(r(t_{i-1})) \mid .$$

From here and (13) we have

$$c_2 \geq \sup_{\{t_i\} \subset N_r} \sum_i \|\tau(t_i)/\|\tau(t_i)\| - \tau(t_{i-1})/\|\tau(t_{i-1})\|\|\| \geq c_4 \vee (\Phi'; 0, T_r).$$

It follows from Theorem 1.1 that $f(\cdot)$ is a RDC function. Sufficiency is proved. □

References

[1] (1981) Demyanov V.F., Vasilyev L.V. Nondifferentiable optimization. *Nauka, Moscow, 384 P.*

[2] Aleksandrov A.D. About the surfaces represented in a view of a difference of two convex functions, *Izvestiya Kazakh. Akad. Sci. Math, 1949, N 3, P. 3-20.*

[3] Aleksandrov A.D. Surfaces represented as a difference of two convex functions, *Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math. , 1950,N 1.*

[4] Hartman P. On functions representable as a difference of convex functions, Pacific J.Math., 9 (1959), pp.707-713.

[5] Zalgaller V.A. About representation of a function of two variables in a view of a difference of two convex functions, *Vestnik of Leningrad University, N 1, 1963, P.44-45.*

[6] Hiriart Urruty J.-B. Generalized differentiability, duality and optimization for problems dealing with differences of convex functions, *Convex And Duality in Optimization (Groningen, 1984), vol. 256 of Lecture Notes in Econom. And Math. Systems, Springer, Berlin, 1985, pp.37-70.*

[7] Proudnikov I.M. The necessary and sufficient conditions of a representation of a homogeneous function in a view of a difference of two convex functions, *Izvestiya Russian Acad. Sci. Math. , V.59, N 5, 1992, P.1116-1128.*

[8] Clarke F.H. Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis. *Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1983.*

[9] (1976) Kolmogorov A.N., Fomin C.V. Elements of the function's theory and the functional Analysis. *Nauka, Moscow, 544 P.*

[10] (1974) Pogorelov A.V. Differential geometric. *Moscow, Nauka, 1974, 176 P.*